

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PATRICK MISSUD,

No. C 15-04693 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, *et al.*,

**ORDER DENYING
RULE 60 MOTION**

Defendants.

Plaintiff Patrick A. Missud was declared a vexatious litigant in 2012 and is currently subject to pre-filing review. *Missud v. National Rifle Association*, No. 3:13-mc-80263-WHA, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 170498, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2013); *Missud v. San Francisco Superior Court*, No. 3:12-cv-03117-WHA, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137351, at *9–10 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2012). In July 2013, Attorney Missud was placed on involuntary inactive status with the State Bar of California, after he was charged with seven counts of professional misconduct. In October 2013, his membership in the bar of this Court was suspended. *In The Matter of Patrick Alexandre Missud — # 219614*, No. 3:13-mc-80182-WHA, Dkt. No. 3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2013).


Missud commenced this action against numerous governmental entities and officials alleging a conspiracy involving parking tickets, which he describes as “Ferguson-on-\$teroid\$.” This action was related to a previous action and reassigned to the undersigned. The action was dismissed.

1 Missud received certain documents in response to a request for public records from the
2 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency that prove his claims that the City of San
3 Francisco has engaged in “an 11-year, half-billion-dollar racketeering \$cheme” relating to
4 towing services. Missud submitted these documents in connection with his motion for
5 reconsideration of the order dismissing this action. He now seeks relief from the order denying
6 reconsideration under Rule 60(b)(3) because, he argues, the city attorney improperly withheld
7 those documents in response to a discovery request in a separate case.

8 Missud’s motion is baseless. The orders from which he seeks relief considered the
9 evidence that he claims the city attorney improperly withheld. Missud’s vexatious motion is
10 plainly designed to waste judicial and government resources. The motion is hereby **DENIED**.

11
12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14 Dated: December 2, 2015.

15 
16 WILLIAM ALSUP
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28